DRAFT

2004 Technical Advisor's Evaluation of Projects

This report contains the **final** results of the 2004 technical advisor's evaluation of 188 projects submitted by lead entities. The report consists of 188 evaluation forms and a nine-page spreadsheet identifying "projects of concern" as described in the Salmon Recovery Funding Board's (SRFB) 5th Round Policies and Project Selection Manual 18, Appendix C.

General Approach

A seven-member group of technical experts evaluated 188 projects submitted by 26 lead entities. The purpose of the evaluations primarily was to designate any projects the group believed had low benefit to salmon, were unlikely to be successful, or were not cost-effective. The technical advisors did not otherwise rate, score, or rank projects. The Review Panel's technical advisors took into account that at the time of application, some projects may not have been completely designed or may not have identified specific parcels for purchase. It is expected that projects will follow best management practices, when available, and will meet any state and federal permitting requirements.

Process

Field Trips (March-July 2004)

At the invitation of the lead entities, teams of technical advisors visited projects. Two weeks before each visit, the lead entity was asked to provide basic project information for the technical advisors. The technical advisors identified 37 projects of concern. Applicants and lead entities had until the July 16 submittal deadline to consider making changes. The technical advisors spent from July 17 to September 6 reviewing all of the application materials and filling out individual evaluation forms for each project.

September Evaluation

On September 7-8, the technical advisors met with SRFB staff to discuss each project to decide if it should have the label of project of concern removed, retained for the same or new reasons, or if new concerns arose to make new projects of concern. From this two-day discussion, the technical advisors identified 55 projects of concern. These draft evaluations were then sent to the lead entities for review by applicants from September 10-17. As applicants provided comments and clarifying information these materials were sent to the technical advisors for consideration.

October Evaluations

On October 1, the technical advisors participated in a telephone conference call with SRFB staff to consider the new information as a means to remove or retain the label of project of concern. This review resulted in the technical advisors identifying 34 projects

of concern and completing evaluation forms for each of these projects that explained the reasons for their decisions. Additionally, the technical advisors continued reviewing the materials submitted by applicants both before and after the September 17 deadline.

On October 7, the technical advisors met in person with SRFB staff to once again review the 34 projects of concern. After lengthy discussion, the technical advisors concluded their deliberations with 27 projects of concern. Specific criteria from SRFB Manual 18, Appendix C, were identified as the justification for their final decisions on projects of concern… see the last page of the nine-page spreadsheet listing all 188 projects for the specific criteria. Additionally, one project, although not a project of concern, was found to merit "special conditions" in the event the project is found worthy of funding. Upon completing their work on the morning of October 7, they presented their final findings to the Review Panel for consideration during its deliberations later that afternoon.

As well as identifying projects of concern the technical advisors provided helpful suggestions to many other projects as a means to make good projects even better.

Summary

In summary, 188 projects were submitted by July 16. Three were determined to be ineligible and the applicants and lead entities withdrew another three projects. Of the 182 remaining projects, 27 or 15 percent are projects of concern.

The attached nine-page Excel spreadsheet lists the lead entity ranked projects and the final projects of concern.

A list of the seven technical advisors and a brief resume on each member are below.

5TH Round Technical Advisors

- **Steve Toth**, consulting hydrologist, Seattle. He served on the SRFB's technical panel in rounds 3 and 4 and has expertise in watershed analyses, evaluating surface water and groundwater hydrology, surveying channel morphology and fish habitat, assessing riparian forest functions, delineating wetlands, analyzing slope stability, and calculating road erosion. He was a Fulbright Scholar in water management in Hungary and gained a College of Forest Resources Graduate School Fellowship at University of Washington. He studied biology as an undergraduate at Carlton College and received his master's degree in forest hydrology from the University of Washington.

- **Pat Powers**, engineer, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Olympia. He is a nationally recognized expert in aquatic habitat restoration and fish passage and was a prime contributor to the department's recently published report titled, "Integrated Streambank Protection Guidelines." He received his master's and bachelor's degrees in civil engineering from Washington State University with an emphasis in hydrology, hydraulics, river engineering, fish passage, and fisheries engineering.

- **Jeff Dillon**, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Seattle. A fish biologist, he served on the SRFB's 4th round technical panel. He also is the lead biologist responsible for ongoing fisheries investigations of juvenile and adult salmon and the lead biologist in several western Washington basins and estuaries within Puget Sound. He earned his bachelor's degree in fish biology from Colorado State University where he also completed ROTC training and was awarded a commission as an engineer officer for the U.S. Army.

- **Phillip J. DeCillis**, U.S. Forest Service, district fisheries biologist, Forks. He has expertise in forest management, fish habitat, surveying, watershed restoration, environmental analysis, project planning, fish passage, large woody debris placement, riparian restoration, and effectiveness monitoring. He received his bachelor's degree in environmental studies from The Evergreen State College and his associate's degree in fisheries technology from Peninsula College.

- **Gary L. Kedish**, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Upper Columbia Fish and Wildlife Office, Spokane. He has expertise in bull trout biology and recovery, Endangered Species Act Section 7 consultation for land use impacts on anadromous fish and forest management. He received his master's degree in natural resources and his bachelor's degree in wildlife and range sciences from the University of Idaho.

- **Richard Brocksmith**, habitat program manager, Hood Canal Coordinating Council, Quilcene. He has expertise in nearshore and marine ecology, salmon restoration and research, with field experience in Oklahoma, Wyoming,

Washington, California, and Alaska. He earned his bachelor's degree in zoology and fisheries ecology at Oklahoma State University and his master's degree in fish ecology at the University of Washington.

- **Tom Slocum**, engineer, district engineer in Mount Vernon for the conservation districts of San Juan, Skagit, Whatcom, and Whidbey Island. He has expertise in engineering, permitting, project management, construction inspection and project monitoring related to salmon habitat restoration, erosion control, and storm water management. He received his law degree (cum laude) from the Seattle University Law School, his master's degree in civil engineering from the Northeastern University and his bachelor's degree from Dartmouth College.